

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance based on the below comments are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9, 11, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Siddiqui, et al. (US 6,292,666) and Sykas (0-8186-7852-6/97 1997 IEEE titled "Inter-Operator Roaming Scenarios for Third Generation Mobile Telecommunication Systems"); claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Siddiqui in view of Sykas and Halminen (US 6,477,378) and claims 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Siddiqui, Sykas and Kimoto (US 6,115,611). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a position detector; a memory for storing information of a domain and radio communication system information corresponding of said domain, a selection unit for selecting a radio communication system corresponding to said domain, to which said current position belongs, on the basis of current position detected by said position detector, said domain information stored in said memory and the radio communication system information corresponding to said domain; and a radio communication unit.

As recited in claim 1, information pertaining to a domain and the radio communication system corresponding to the domain is stored in a radio

communication device. A selection of a radio communication system is determined based on a current position, domain information and radio communication system information corresponding to the domain.

In contrast, Siddiqui teaches a communication system that can determine the position of a mobile station including identifying the country the mobile station is located using GPS technology. This information can be provided to the mobile station user via the mobile station itself. This information is provided to the user so the user can determine what telephone prefix should be used based on the location. See column 4, lines 29-65 to column 5, lines 1-60. Thus, Siddiqui only teaches obtaining a position location, Siddiqui does not teach or suggest, as recognized in the Office Action, selecting a radio communication based on positioning, let alone positioning, domain information and radio communication system information correlating to the domain information.

The Office Action alleges Sykas teaches the deficiencies of Siddiqui and the communication of Sykas teachings with Siddiquis teachings provides the claimed features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Sykas teaches a mobile communication system that can initiate and receive calls anywhere using a single mobile device. This universal operation is achieved by checking for various operations that will provide access to the mobile phone at the location of the mobile phone. Once a determination is made on the various operators available, one of the operators can be selected as the communication means of the mobile phone. The scanning and selection of operators can be

accomplished automatically or manually. See paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3. Thus, in the teachings of Sykas, selection is based on operator availability in a particular area, not on position, stored domain information and radio communication system information corresponding to the domain as in the present invention.

Thus, the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1 as required.

Claim 11

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, a detector to detect current position of a wireless terminal; a memory to store information regarding a plurality of wireless communication system, a selection unit to select a first wireless communication system corresponding to a communication area associated with a current position of the wireless terminal; wherein said selection unit to select and change from said first wireless communication system to an alternative wireless communication system corresponding to a different communication area in response to said detector detecting said wireless terminal preparing to enter said different communication area; wherein said detector and said wireless terminal being physically distinct from each other.

Claim 11 recites similar features to claim 1. Claim 11 further includes the feature of a selection unit and wireless terminal being physically distinct from each other. Thus, the selection unit and wireless device are in communication with one another but are different devices.

Claim 11 is novel over the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas for the same reasons as argued above regarding claim 1. Simply stated the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas fail to teach or suggest selecting a communication system based on a position of a wireless terminal. Further, Siddiqui and Sykas fail to teach or suggest a memory to store information regarding a plurality of wireless communication systems, each corresponding to a particular communication area. In each of the system of Siddiqui and Sykas, information is relayed to the mobile terminal. It is up to the mobile terminal to change wireless communication systems within the teachings of Siddiqui and Sykas. The mobile terminal does not provide a memory for storing a plurality of wireless communication systems for particular communication areas.

Also, Siddiqui and Sykas do not teach or suggest a selection unit and a wireless terminal as being physically distinct. In fact, Sykas teaches to the contrary. Sykas teaches the selection of an operator by the mobile phone (wireless terminal) itself. Thus, the mobile phone and the selection unit are not physically distinct. Further, Siddiqui fails to teach any type of selection unit.

Thus, in view of the above, the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas fail to teach each and every feature of claim 11 as required.

Claim 15

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, detecting a current position of the wireless terminal; providing information regarding a plurality of wireless communication

systems; selecting a first wireless communication system corresponding to the communication area associated with the current position of the wireless terminal; selecting and changing, for continued operation of said wireless terminal, from said first wireless communication system to an alternative wireless communication system corresponding to a different communication area in response to detecting said wireless terminal preparing to enter said different communication areas; and displaying information to a user regarding said change from the first wireless communication system to the alternative wireless communication system.

Claim 15 recites similar features to claims 1 and 11. Claim 15 further includes displaying changes made from a first wireless communication system to an alternative wireless communication system. This gives the user information that a change has been made.

Claim 15 is novel over the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas for the same reasons as claims 1 and 11. Simply stated, the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas fails to teach selecting a wireless communication system corresponding to a communication area associated with the current position of the wireless terminal for operation of said wireless terminal; selecting and changing, for continued operation of said wireless terminal, from said first wireless communication system to an alternative wireless communication system corresponding to a different communication area in response to detecting said wireless terminal preparing to enter said different communication area.

Further, the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas fails to teach displaying information to a user regarding said change from the first wireless communication to the alternative wireless communication system as recited in claim 15. Siddiqui teaches displaying positioning coordinates and current country location but not information regarding changes in communication services. In fact, Siddiqui does not teach or suggest changing wireless communication systems. Also, Sykas teaches displaying operator information but does not teach or suggest information regarding the change from a first wireless communication system to an alternative wireless communication system.

Thus, the combination of Siddiqui and Sykas fails to teach each and every feature of claim 15 as required.

Applicants further note that Halminen and Kimoto fail to make up for the deficiencies of Siddiqui and Sykas. Also, dependent claims 2-10 and 12-14 are likewise distinguishable over the combination of references for the above reasons. Based on the above arguments and the lack of the establishment of a prima facie case of obviousness for each of the independent claims, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-15 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/CJB:cb
0925-0190P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s)